REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. New claims 39-42 are added. Claims 1-42 are pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 19 stands allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-18 and 20-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,573 to Darago et al. (hereinafter "Darago") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,125 to Traversat et al. (hereinafter "Traversat"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-18 and 20-38 are not obvious over Darago in view of Traversat.

Darago is directed to managing courseware and/or other content in a shared use operating environment (see, col. 7, lines 49-51), which is an environment in which more than one person can use content, without necessarily sharing a specific copy of that content, with the assistance of a computer network or a collection of coupled networks (see, col. 8, lines 1-5). Darago discloses a system including a registration server, multiple content servers, and multiple clients (see, Fig. 1). Each content server contains courseware and/or other works managed by the architecture of Darago (see, col. 8, lines 50-51), and each content server serves the managed content for presentation to registered users (see, col. 8, lines 55-57). Each client workstation is able to present, to at least one registered user,

courseware and/or other content which is served over a link by a content server (see, col. 9, lines 20-23). Registration provides users with a unique user name or user ID, may also coordinate a password or otherwise manage access control, and may also obtain billing or payment information such as the user's credit card information (see, col. 8, lines 58-64).

Traversat is directed to a data framework or schema and associated protocol for exchanging data residing in the schema among computers in a computer network (see, col. 5, lines 62-64). Data relating to a client is stored in a client schema that resides in the client memory, and configuration data for each of the clients is stored in a server schema which resides on a network server (see, col. 6, lines 7-10). Configuration data is exchanged between the two schema's or hierarchies through a client/server protocol which insures that the correct information is derived from the server schema and is transported or entered into the client schema on the client machine and vice versa (see, col. 6, lines 11-15). The data schema of Traversat allows a network administrator to manage configuration information for each of the computers in the network from a central repository such as single server (see, col. 6, lines 19-23).

With respect to claim 1, it was asserted in the November 1, 2002 Final Office Action (see, ¶ 6, p. 4) that:

> **Darago** does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer. However, **Traversat** teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer (figures 6a-c, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11).

Thus, Traversat is being relied on in the November 1, 2002 Final Office Action as teaching collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of

the client computer as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Traversat does not disclose or suggest collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer as recited in claim 1.

The cited portion of Traversat discusses "flowcharts showing a process of establishing a connection between a client and a server and exchanging configuration information in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention." (see, col. 10, lines 29-32). The cited portion of Traversat discloses, at col. 10, line 57 – col. 11, line 3, that:

> Once the version of the software has been established the client sends its specific profile information to the server at step 611. In many instances this specific profile information is typically hardcoded in the clients PROM. For example, the specific profile information for a client would include the type of computer such as a Sun JDM1 workstation or an IBM NS1000 computer. Once the server receives the profile information from the client, the server attempts to match the profile with a specific profile in its machine namespace 303 under the platform sub-category 311 at sep 613 of FIG. 3. The server schema machine namespace 303 contains the category platforms 311 which stores specific profile information on particular types of computers made by computer manufacturers.

Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in this cited portion of Traversat discloses collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer as recited in claim 1. The cited portion discloses that the client "sends its specific profile information to the server", but there is no mention in Traversat that this profile information is registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer as recited in claim 1.

As seen above, the cited portion of Traversat also states that the "server schema machine namespace 303 contains the category platforms 311 which stores specific profile information on particular types of computers made by computer manufacturers". However, this information on particular types of computers made by computer manufacturers mentioned in Traversat is simply information that is stored in Traversat. Nothing in this information makes any mention or suggestion of collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere else in Traversat is there any disclosure or suggestion of collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer. Traversat states, at col. 6, lines 19-27, that:

> The data schema of the present invention allows a network administrator to manage configuration information for each of the computers in the network from a central repository such as a single server. Thus, any software updates, version upgrades, or installation of new applications that require knowledge of and access to a subsystem configuration can be implemented from the central repository and propagated to the individual clients.

Thus, as exemplified by this portion of Traversat, Applicant respectfully submits that Traversat is directed to making configuration information available to a network administrator, not collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer as claimed in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Traversat does not disclose or suggest collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer as claimed in claim 1. Darago is not cited as

overcoming, and does not overcome, the deficiencies of Traversat discussed above.

In addition, claim 1 recites, in part:

> establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network;
> establishing a first connection, via the communication link, to a first registration server of a plurality of registration servers;
> communicating at least a first portion of the registration information to the first registration server via the first connection;
> establishing a second connection, via the communication link, to a second registration server of the plurality of registration servers; and
> communicating at least a second portion of the registration information to the second registration server via the second connection.

It was asserted in the November 1, 2002 Final Office Action (see, ¶ 6, pp. 3-4) that these elements of claim 1, including establishing the first connection and establishing the second connection, are taught by Darago. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Darago discloses a registration server level 102 that includes a registration server 108, and a content server level 104 that includes content servers 110 (see, Fig. 1 and col. 8, lines 20-35). All new registrations go through the registration server 108, and new user registration information is processed on the registration server 108 (see, col. 11, lines 11-13). Also, the registration database is replicated in a read-only format to content servers 110 so they can recognize registered users, but a new user registration cannot be created directly on a content server 110 (see, col. 11, lines 15-18, and col. 13, lines 49-54).

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that nowhere in these discussions of registration and registration server 108 does Darago discuss **establishing two**

connections to two registration servers via the same communication link as recited in claim 1. Merely disclosing that a registration server 108 is present in a registration level does not disclose or suggest establishing two connections to two registration servers via the same communication link. Additionally, merely disclosing that all new registrations go through a registration server and that content servers can recognize registered users does not disclose or suggest establishing two connections to two registration servers via the same communication link. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere else in Darago is there any disclosure or suggestion of establishing two connections to two registration servers via the same communication link as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Darago does not disclose or suggest establishing two connections to two registration servers via the same communication link as recited in claim 1. Traversat is not cited as overcoming, and does not overcome, the deficiencies of Darago discussed above.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Darago in view of Traversat.

With respect to claim 8, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 1, Darago in view of Traversat does not disclose or suggest collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer as recited in claim 8, or establishing a plurality of connections, via a communication link, between the client computer and a plurality of registration databases as recited in claim 8. For at least these reasons,

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is allowable over Darago in view of Traversat.

With respect to claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 1, Darago in view of Traversat does not disclose or suggest collecting registration information for a plurality of registering components of a client computer as recited in claim 14. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is allowable over Darago in view of Traversat.

With respect to claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 1, Darago in view of Traversat does not disclose or suggest a registration wizard to collect registration information for a plurality of manufacturers of a plurality of components of a client computer as recited in claim 23. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is allowable over Darago in view of Traversat.

With respect to claim 28, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 1, Darago in view of Traversat does not disclose or suggest a client computer to collect registration information for a plurality of manufacturers of components of the client computer, or to upload portions of registration information to registration databases of a plurality of registration databases via a single communication link as recited in claim 28. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 is allowable over Darago in view of Traversat.

With respect to claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 1, Darago in view of Traversat does not

disclose or suggest a memory to store a plurality of instructions that are executed by a processor and cause the processor to collect registration information for manufacturers of components of an apparatus, and to establish, via a communication link, a plurality of connections between the apparatus and a plurality of registration databases as recited in claim 29. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 is allowable over Darago in view of Traversat.

Given that claims 2-7 and 31-33 depend from claim 1, claims 9-13 and 34 depend from claim 8, claims 15-22 and 35 depend from claim 14, claims 24-27 and 36 depend from claim 23, claim 37 depends from claim 28, and claims 30 and 38 depend from claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-22, 24-27, and 30-38 are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above regarding their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 39-42 are added to this application.

With respect to new claim 39, claim 39 depends from claim 1 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 39 is allowable over the cited references due to its dependency on claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the first registration server corresponds to a manufacturer of an operating system executing on the client computer, and wherein the second registration server corresponds to a manufacturer of the client

computer as recited in claim 39. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 39 is allowable over the cited references.

With respect to new claim 40, claim 40 depends from claim 8 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 40 is allowable over the cited references due to its dependency on claim 8. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a method as recited in claim 8, wherein one of the plurality of registration databases corresponds to a manufacturer of an operating system executing on the client computer, and wherein another of the plurality of registration databases corresponds to a manufacturer of the client computer as recited in claim 40. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 40 is allowable over the cited references.

With respect to new claim 41, claim 41 depends from claim 1 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 41 is allowable over the cited references due to its dependency on claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the collecting comprises accessing a plurality of registration documents to identify which registration information to collect as recited in claim 41. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 41 is allowable over the cited references.

With respect to new claim 42, claim 42 depends from claim 14 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 42 is allowable over the cited references due to its dependency on claim 14. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a method as recited in claim 14,

wherein the collecting comprises accessing a plurality of registration documents to identify which registration information to collect as recited in claim 42. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 42 is allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 5/1/03.

By: _____
Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256